## **EXHIBIT N**

## 2011.01.24 Trial Transcript Day 13 1/24/2011 2:45:00 PM

		3078			308
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		1	PROCEEDINGS	
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA RICHMOND DIVISION		2		
4	NO INIONE DIVISION		3	THE CLERK: Civil action number 3:09CV00620, ePlus,	
5	·		4	Incorporated versus Lawson Software, Incorporated. Mr. Scott	
6	ePLUS, INC. : Civil Action No.		5	L. Robertson, Mr. Craig T. Merritt, Ms. Jennifer A. Albert, and	
7	: 3:09CV620 vs. :		6	Mr. Michael G. Strapp represent the plaintiff.	
,	:		7	Mr. Daniel W. McDonald, Mr. Dabney J. Carr, IV, Ms.	
8	LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : January 24, 2011		8	Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Mr. William D. Schultz represent the	
9	·		9	defendant. Are counsel ready to proceed?	
10 11	COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY TRIAL		10	MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor.	
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE		11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, Your Honor.	
13 14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY		12	THE COURT: All right. I was very sorry to hear	
	APPEARANCES:		13	about Ms. Albert's father passing away. You all both wrote	
15	Scott L. Robertson, Esquire		14	letters about it. I don't see the point in bringing that to	
16	Michael G. Strapp, Esquire		15	the attention the jury. Do either one of you?	
17	David M. Young, Esquire Goodwin Procter, LLP		16	In the old days, when people didn't do what they were	
	901 New York Avenue NW		17	supposed to do, they got keelhauled. I'm about ready to	
8	Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20001		18	institute that procedure here. It's time for the jury to get	
19	-		19	going, and I've had to read all this stuff now. I told you	
20	Craig T. Merritt, Esquire Christian & Barton, LLP		20	what to do about this verdict form, and it was pretty easy, and	
	909 East Main Street		21	it's unnecessary to go through all this stuff.	
21	Suite 1200 Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095		22	Now, apparently we're going to have to revise it	
22	Counsel for the plaintiff		23	anyway because and some of the instructions. What	
23 24	Peppy Peterson, RPR		24	instructions have to be revised because Lawson is not	
	Official Court Reporter United States District Court		25	contending that the RIMS brochure is prior art? Which one is	
25	Simos States Biolina Godin				
		3079			308
1					
1	APPEARANCES: (cont'g)		1	arguing?	
	APPEARANCES: (cont'g) Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire				
			1 2 3	arguing?  MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the	
2	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building		2	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the	
3	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point		2	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS	
2 3 4	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219		2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it	
2 3 4	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point		2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated	
2 3 4 5	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire		2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it	
2 3 4 5	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC		2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?	
2 3 4 5	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.	
2 3 4 5 6	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?	
2 3 4 5 6 7	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art.  THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art.  THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art.  THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it  MR. McDONALD: It's evidence of the Fisher RIMS	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art.  THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it  MR. McDONALD: It's evidence of the Fisher RIMS system as it was being sold and	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1 22 23 24 25	Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire Troutman Sanders, LLP Troutman Sanders Building 1001 Haxall Point Richmond, Virginia 23219 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire William D. Schultz, Esquire Merchant & Gould, PC 80 South Eighth Street Suite 3200		2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, David Young for ePlus. It's instruction 3-A that was submitted to the Court over the weekend. It lists as I think reference number three, RIMS brochure, and that would have to come out now because it appears that Lawson does not have that as an anticipated reference on its own verdict form.  THE COURT: Is that right?  MR. McDONALD: Yes, that's right, Your Honor.  THE COURT: So I suppose I need to tell the jury simply to disregard any testimony about the RIMS brochure as prior art.  MR. McDONALD: No, it not anticipatory prior art meaning it's not all by itself anticipating a claim. We're still using it for obviousness and support for the on sale, the RIMS as prior art and 102(a) and (b), but the brochure, all by itself, we're not contending is an anticipating reference, but it would be used to support number one in the instruction which is the Fisher RIMS system as prior art.  THE COURT: What do you mean, to be used to support? If you're going to use it  MR. McDONALD: It's evidence of the Fisher RIMS	

## 2011.01.24 Trial Transcript Day 13 1/24/2011 2:45:00 PM

		2011.0		That Hanschpt Day 13 1/24/2011	
		3174			3176
1	choice. And that doesn't stop ePlus from going to the		1	preferably, right? Then a textual description of	
2	Patent Office, but it is true and the Judge will		2	items and preferably, not necessarily, images of the	
3	instruct you that even if a product isn't the subject		3	items.	
4	of a patent like TV/2, if it's on sale more than a		4	So that meets the definition of a catalog	
5	year before the filing date of the ePlus patent, it's		5	pretty well. That holds up with your common sense.	
6	still prior art. EPlus can't go get a patent on that		6	And it's pretty consistent if we go to slide 48, I	
7	same thing. So that's how it works. So that's why		7	think it is. Even what the patent says about	
8	the Patent Office doesn't always have all the details		8	catalogs. This is a feature of the invention to have	
9	about what everybody is doing out there.		9	multiple catalogs from different suppliers. And it	
10	So that's why because you have this critical		10	gives these examples. And I'll summarize it here, but	
11	information here in the courtroom that the Patent		11	basically it talks about published by a vendor,	
12	Office didn't get why you should reach a different		12	distributor, having the distributor's catalog numbers	
13	conclusion from the Patent Office. So that's why you		13	for their listed products. And also vendor	
14	should decide that the claims are invalid.		14	manufacturer part numbers. Down at the bottom, line	
15	Let's go down to question No. 3 about		15	52 there, it further contained catalogs published by	
16	infringement. We made it pretty clear from the first		16	some of the vendor manufacturers. Again having part	
17	moment in this case that this issue came down to the		17	numbers and the like.	
18	catalogs issue.		18	Then if you go down to about line 56. It can	
19	And if we could go to 45F. Mr. Weaver at		19	also contain catalogs published by outside suppliers,	
20	least acknowledged that 11 of the 12 claims in this		20	other manufacturers, distributors listing their vendor	
21	case required not just one catalog, but multiple		21	products different from those in the distributor	
			22	•	
22 23	catalogs in the Lawson system. So if Lawson doesn't		23	catalog. So these are all these different published	
	have multiple catalogs, Lawson at least does not		23	things out there.	
24	infringe those 11 claims. We're all on the same page			So if we go back to 46. So that was the	
25	on that. That's why we didn't waste your time on all		25	Court's definition of "catalog." Very consistent with	
		0475			0477
		3175			3177
1	these other deals in the case, why it really came down		1	what the patent says. What about that last claim?	
2	to the catalogs.		2	I'll just talk about that a little bit. That 12th	
3	And if we go to the slide 46, this was the		3	claim. That's Claim 1 of the '172 patent.	
4	Court's definition of catalogs. It has the term		4	Now, that claim has a claim element that	
5	published by a vendor in it, and the Court also has an		5	refers to something called an order list. So I want	
6	instruction for you on that.		6	to show you the Court's definition of that in slide	
7	And we showed you here, this is Exhibit 257,		7	49. So even that claim requires a means for	
8	it's a demonstrative, but it's nothing of the sort you		8	generating an order list, which is a list of desired	
9	haven't seen before. It's one of these big catalogs.		9	catalog items. So here's where that concept of	
10	We don't get them in the mail so much anymore, but we		10	catalog comes into play here.	
11	used to. And something like this pretty clearly meets		11	And if we look at slide 49A, Dr. Weaver, his	
12	that Court definition. You can apply this pretty		12	analysis was entirely reliant on his opinion that the	
13	well. It's an organized collection. You have got the		13	Lawson system had catalogs in it. And that even	
14	ladies clothes at the beginning. Then it goes to kids		14	included this claim.	
15	and boots and shoes and so on, product by product		15	And if we could go to the next slide here.	
16	organized. It's about items. Things Sears is selling		16	This was Dr. Weaver's testimony specific to that Claim	
17	with associated information. Published by Sears.		17	1 of the '172 patent. It's kind of a long question	
18	They are a seller, a distributor, whatever you want to		18	here, but what's being shown here is his opinion about	
19	call it. Includes things like a part number, price,		19	Lawson infringing that claim, and specifically the	
	catalog number, vendor name. Sears is on the front.		20	part of that claim that refers to an order list, that	
20				was based in new on his analysis sensity disc that the	
20 21	It may not be on every page, but certainly on the		21	was based in part on his analysis concluding that the	
	It may not be on every page, but certainly on the front.		21 22	desired items - do you remember an order list is a	
21					
21 22	front.		22	desired items - do you remember an order list is a	